

they can be edited on the world wide web by using relatively low bandwidth connections. Yokomizo notes that while it is conceivable that salt photographs are digitized into digital images and sent through a net work for processing, such invention does not seem likely to be successful from a commercial point of view because the processing and delivery through the network will raise the fees for the services to a level that cannot easily be accepted by a household economy due to the large amount of the digital data to be transferred through the network.

Yokomizo proposes a method that permits still photographs to be edited over relatively low bandwidth connections but never mentions processing any type of stored video stream. Applicant respectfully submits that if a network is incapable of effectively transmitting photographic pictures or images, it is necessarily inadequate for transmitting stored video streams. There is nothing in Yokomizo that mentions the possibility that any aspect of his invention could be applied to a stored video stream, none of his examples use stored videostreams, and there is nothing in his description that suggests that any of the techniques that he applies to still images would be applicable to stored videostreams.

Turning to the detailed rejection, the examiner suggests that Yokomizo discloses a system for processing a stored videostream at figures 1, 5-7 and column 5, lines 20 to column 6, line 22. Applicant has perused those sections of the written description and finds no suggestion to process a stored videostream. The disclosure of Yokomizo refers specifically and only to still images.

The claim requires means for determining if the stored video is a digital videostream. Since Yokomizo cannot process digital videostreams, he has no need for and does not show or suggest a means for determining if the stored video is a digital videostream. Column 5, lines 20–30, column 9, lines 15–20 never mentions means for determining whether stored video is a digital video stream and in fact, does not mention stored video at all.

There is nothing in Yokomizo that shows or suggests that creating a low resolution videostream based on the stored videostream. The portions of Yokomizo's description referred to by the examiner relates solely to still images.

There is no means for editing a stored low resolution digital videostream. Column 5, lines 30–68 refer solely to still images. While Yokomizo does include a suggestion to create an edit list, this alone is not enough to anticipate the claims. There is no suggestion in Yokomizo that the edit list could be processed by a video processor, only still photographs are contemplated. There is nothing in Yokomizo that suggests rendering a high resolution videostream, or for storing a high resolution videostream.

With regard to claim 2, because nothing in Yokomizo suggests a detecting a stored videostream, there is no suggestion or mention of converting an analog videostream to a digital videostream.

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the claims 1–2, 4–8, and 10–15 are anticipated by Yokomizo.

Claims 3, 9, and 16 are rejected as unpatentable over Yokomizo in view of Ueda. Even if Ueda teaches to store a videostream in a DVD, this does not satisfy the deficiencies of Yokomizo which never mentions videostreams of any

sort. Even if Yokomizo were modified by using DVD's as an alternative to store the digital still images, the combination would not anticipate any of claims 3, 9, and 16.

Claims 1-4, 8-11, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 21 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linzer in view of Ando, et al.

It is the examiner's position that Linzer '621 teaches all of the limitations of claims 1 and 10 except for the step of determining if the stored videostream is a digital videostream as set forth in claim 1 or a first means for determining if the stored video is a digital videostream in claim 10. The examiner says that Ando teaches these limitations and that it would be obvious to combine Ando with Linzer. Respectfully, applicant disagrees.

Reference to figure 19 and column 23, lines 28 through 62 discloses that Ando can deal with analog or digital videostreams. Ando appears to deal with the two types of videostreams in the same way. For example, Ando states in line 44 of the referenced column that "when an analog video signal and a digital audio signal are input to ADC 1552, the digital audio signal passes through the ADC 1552 (a process for reducing jitter superposed on a digital signal, a process for changing the sampling rate and the number of quantization bits, or the like without changing the contents of a digital audio signal may be done). When a digital video signal and a digital audio signal are input to ADC 1552, these signals pass through ADC 1552 (for these digital signals, a jitter reduction process, sampling rate change process, or the like that do not change their contents may be done)."

Since analog and digital video signals both pass through ADC 1552 and since Ando never mentions detecting or relying on the type of signal nor does he discuss making any changes based on the type of signal, applicant disagrees that Ando shows or suggests any determining step or determining means as the examiner suggests. Moreover, even if Ando showed such means which applicant does not admit, the examiner has not explained why one skilled in the art would combine Ando with Linzer.

Linzer describes an on-line, non-linear video editing system 10 in column 1, starting in line 15. Linzer mentions that either analog or video signals can be supplied to compressor 14 and neither describes or suggests the need for means or apparatus for determining whether a particular stored videostream is a digital videostream. Figures 1, 2 and 3 are illustrations of the prior art. In discussing his invention beginning with Figure 4, Linzer never mentions whether the video signal is an analog or a digital video signal and consequently, there is no suggestion to provide or reason to provide a method or apparatus for determining if stored videostream is a digital videostream. Since Linzer doesn't mention different processing for analog and digital videostreams and therefore doesn't show a system that would benefit from adding additional apparatus to determine if the stored videostream is a digital videostream, applicant respectfully suggested that there would be no reason to combine Ando with Linzer.

In the rejection, the examiner offers no basis for the proposed combination; no advantage that would be created by the combination nor any other reason that one skilled in the art would make the combination. Applicant respectfully submits that in the absence of at least some basis for combining

these two patents, the rejection is not appropriate. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and upon reconsideration withdrawn and the application passed on to issue.

April 11, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "S. Salai", written over a horizontal line.

Stephen B. Salai, Registration No. 26,990
HARTER, SECREST & EMERY LLP
1600 Bausch & Lomb Place
Rochester, New York 14604
Telephone: 585-232-6500
Fax: 585-232-2152